



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/669,624	09/24/2003	John F. Wakerly	062891.1128	5626
5073	7590	03/25/2009	EXAMINER	
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. 2001 ROSS AVENUE SUITE 600 DALLAS, TX 75201-2980				BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2446				
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/25/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptomail1@bakerbotts.com
glenda.orrantia@bakerbotts.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/669,624	WAKERLY, JOHN F.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	BENJAMIN R. BRUCKART	2446

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 16 March 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 - b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 - (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Claims 20, 22-28 rejected under 35 USC 101.
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: None.

Claim(s) objected to: None.

Claim(s) rejected: 1,3-20,22-38 and 40-47.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. Other: _____.

/Joseph E. Avellino/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2446

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection on claims 20, 22-28 is withdrawn based on applicant's amendment.

The objection to the specification and the art rejection remains.

With respect to the argument over official notice, the examiner maintains the rejection. The examiner did take official notice and applicant did fail to reasonably challenge the rejection. Because Applicant has failed to reasonably challenge the Examiner's assertions of well known subject matter in the previous Office action(s) pursuant to the requirements set forth under MPEP §2144.03. A "reasonable challenge" is an explicit demand for evidence set forth by Applicant in the next response. Accordingly, the claim limitations the Examiner considered as "well known" in the first Office action, i.e. "tracking a time when a packet corresponding to reception by the system, bypassing the queue when the queue is empty, storing context data in a shared memory for access by another process, and a code partition not loaded into processor memory, and when referenced, would be loaded into a particular processor memory instruction", are now established as admitted prior art of record for the course of the prosecution. See *In re Chevenard*, 139 F.2d 71, 60 USPQ 239 (CCPA 1943).

As written and improperly argued by applicant, the rejection is maintained.

Regarding to the objection to the specification, the objection is remained. While applicant has admitted lack of antecedence for the claimed limitation and lack of support, applicant has argued they are obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, affirming an obvious variation rejection. While the examiner agrees that a computer readable medium can include statutory subject matter as argued on page 1 of the remarks, those features are not claimed nor are they positively recited in the cited specification support page 21, line 17 to page 24, line 16. While the specification does recite processors and memory and logic. A processor is not defined as a computer readable medium and logic is the steps of execution, again not a computer readable medium. The memory is being utilized and the steps of the invention seem to be performed with memory, but the invention is not limited or explicitly defined on a medium.

The examiner encouraged applicant to amend the specification to include an explicit definition of a computer readable medium to only the statutory subject matter.

Regarding the art rejection, applicant argues the Melvin, Johnson, and Bunce reference fails to teach "in response to the migration request, to identify an available one of the processors having the target code partition loaded."

The examiner maintains the rejection. Melvin para 630-632 is relied upon to teach the argued feature. Melvin teaches "selects a non-busy source for a given non-busy destination." The selecting identifies a non-busy destination interpreted as the available resource for executing the code, the code partition (already identified as memory).